

## New York Tribune.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1913.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation: Ogden M. Reid, President; Conde Hamlin, Secretary; James M. Barrett, Treasurer. Address: Tribune Building, No. 154 Nassau street, New York.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York.  
Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$ 75; Daily only, 6 months..... \$3.00  
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos. 4.25; Daily only, 1 year..... 6.00  
Daily and Sunday, 1 year, 8.50; Sunday only, 6 months..... 1.25  
Daily only, 1 month..... .50; Sunday only, 1 year..... 2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.  
One month..... \$1.50  
One year..... 15.00  
SUNDAY ONLY:  
Six months..... 8.00  
One year..... 12.00  
DAILY ONLY:  
One month..... 1.00  
One year..... 12.00  
CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.  
One month..... 8.50  
One year..... 85.00  
SUNDAY ONLY:  
Six months..... 4.50  
One year..... 8.00  
DAILY ONLY:  
One month..... 6.14  
One year..... 61.26

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

The Tribune uses its best endeavors to insure the trustworthiness of every advertisement it prints and to avoid the publication of all advertisements containing misleading statements or claims.

## Murphy and Brady's "Tainted" \$25,000.

This campaign is disclosing strange things. A year ago anybody who proclaimed Tammany Hall to be the guardian of the honor and virtue of the state and Charles F. Murphy its chief exponent of purity in politics would have been considered a candidate for Matteawan. Yet Tammany is claiming credit for the impeachment of Sulzer and Murphy is solemnly asserting that he gave back the \$25,000 which Anthony N. Brady contributed last fall, through "Sam" Beardsley, of Utica.

It was strange that Sulzer, candidate for Governor, declined the money. It was natural enough, under those circumstances, for Murphy to ask "What's the matter with it?" But, no taint having been disclosed which would render it impossible of use as legal tender, it is passing strange that Murphy should ponder the matter and then decide to hand this handsome contribution back.

Unfortunately, Mr. Brady is dead and the High Court of Impeachment declined to let Beardsley tell about this transaction, so the public is not likely ever to know what all the money. Brady was Gas, and Electricity and Water Power, to be sure. He was the Interests, in capital letters. But that never bothered Tammany before, either in Murphy's reign or prior thereto. Tammany has done business impartially with the street railway crowd and the elevated railway people; just as Tammany has done business with the railroads seeking privileges and the building material interests endeavoring to get a building code favorable to their particular brand of fireproofing.

But Tammany never has been known to be finicky. It has been willing to do business with the saloonkeepers and the gambling house proprietors, and has not shied off very far from the brothel keepers. So it seems reasonable to believe that something very, very terrible must have been the matter with Brady's \$25,000 to force Murphy to return it.

It is just possible Murphy didn't return it, in spite of his assertion. Sulzer says that Murphy considers it unlucky to return money once he has it in his hands. And maybe Sulzer's right; he's had experience enough with campaign contributions and with Murphy to speak with authority on both subjects.

## The Panama Free Port Plan.

The suggestion of a free port at Panama, which was made yesterday at the Southern Commercial Congress, is a reminder that the isthmian canal will be something more than a waterway. It will be a sort of central station, where many lines of commerce from all parts of the world will meet and cross, and where there will be opportunity for a vast amount of exchanging. These conditions will naturally mean the building there of a considerable city devoted to trade and industry, and especially to the transshipment of commerce.

It is pointed out that the free port system has chiefly contributed to the enormous development of Hamburg, Hong Kong, Singapore and other cities, without, of course, at all interfering with the regular customs duties of the countries in which they are situated. A free port at the isthmus would not affect canal tolls or the tariff system of this country. It would mean that in a world emporium goods could be bought and sold and exchanged without payment of import or export dues.

Louis Napoleon once predicted that an isthmian canal there would develop the greatest commercial city of the world. The prospect of such an achievement is not unreasonable, and it is carefully to be considered whether the free port system will not be necessary for it.

## Cure the Children's Ills.

It is to be hoped the Department of Health will obtain the increase in its budget for the Division of Child Hygiene which it is seeking. The total amount of the increase is \$20,100. For this the bureau expects to hire nine additional nurses, five additional medical inspectors and eleven additional dentists, to supplement a staff which experience has demonstrated to be entirely too small to do the work allotted to it.

There are more than 800,000 school children in this city, and the number now is about 40,000 greater than it was last year. In 1912 the doctors and nurses of the Division of Child Hygiene examined more than 200,000 children for disease and found that 72 per cent needed medical attention. But the rest had to go unhealed for, whatever their ailments. It is believed that the increased staff sought will be able to care for the increased school enrollment this year, and perhaps do something toward caring for the proportion of the enrollment unvisited last year. It is poor economy to let minor ills in children develop into serious ones for lack of attention, and eventually compel attention in the city's clinics and hospitals. This increased appropriation is for a worthy purpose.

## Leading and Following in Mexico.

It is gratifying to know that the European powers will follow the lead of the United States in Mexico. They are under no compulsion to do so, but their doing so will be an act of courtesy confirming international amity and making for the solution of a vexatious problem. It will also be sentimentally welcome and practically helpful to the United States.

But it would be a great mistake to regard it as relieving this country of responsibility. On the contrary, it lays upon us an added burden. If those powers are to follow our lead we must give them

a leadership worth following. If their policy toward Mexico is to be based upon ours our policy must be so definite and substantial as to provide a decent basis for theirs.

In brief, while welcoming European support for our policy, and while profiting by whatever advantage may accrue to us from it, this country is for that very reason the more bound not to rely upon that support, but to define and to maintain a policy which would stand, if necessary, entirely alone. The United States must not be passively pushed forward by its European friends, but must take for itself a bold initiative and draw them after it.

## The Sad End of a Great Man.

It was all too obvious that Mr. Murphy had been far from himself of late. Once a silent, masterful Napoleon of politics, he has become little more than a quivering lump of worry.

Now the explanation begins to appear. Yet this crucial question still remains: Was Mr. Murphy already a shadow of his former self when Mr. Brady's \$25,000 came within his grasp; or was it the return of the \$25,000 which first broke a mighty heart and crumbled our hero in the dust?

## Baseball and Matrimony.

In the name of the national game and all who hold it sacred protest must be entered against that Pennsylvania man—yes, from the state which produced the Athletics—who deserted his wife because she was a "fan." He rectified, just as if it were a legitimate cause of complaint, that she attended the ball game nearly every day, compelling him to get his own supper, and talked baseball all the time; whereas, he took no interest in the sport.

If this unfortunate and misguided man's wife had been a suffragette, who insisted on endeavoring to convert him to the cause, he might have had real ground for complaint. If she had neglected his supper to give soap box lectures on the corner, as did the wife of a Brooklyn citizen who recently took his case to the courts, this anti-fan might have acquired sympathy in the community.

If she had only displayed an unconquerable devotion to the family piano at inopportune hours there might possibly have been some shadow of justification for his conduct. But for a man to possess a wife with a love for the game and knowledge enough of it to appreciate it and then to desert her—verily, it is almost a case of pearls before swine. His punishment should be to buy her a season ticket and cook his own meals until he can enjoy the game with her.

## Bosh from a Master Hand.

The McCall campaign is wrecked and sinking. Distress signals are going up. And as a last sign of panic Mr. Joseph Johnson is turned loose to rant upon the decks.

There is a faint possibility that we are doing some unknown driveller a wrong in ascribing the daily "Common Sense Talks" to Mr. Johnson. But we doubt it. Mr. Johnson's bosh is in a class by itself, and these outpourings in the advertising columns show a master's touch.

Half of yesterday's column sobs over Mayor Gaynor in exactly the tone that Mr. Johnson used when he was hopping around the Mayor's open grave and trying to save a little glory from the wreck. Then comes the young upstart, Mitchell—his crimes and misdemeanors. One of them seems to be that he was nominated when "the flowers were scarcely withered at Greenwood," a heartrending piece of effrontery to Mr. Johnson's sensitive soul. But the damning climax is this:

Mitchell: A practiser of the bunny hug—  
After that what can be said? A shocked city will turn instantly to the alternative thus glowingly described:

Edward E. McCall, the upright judge, the fearless administrator, the friend, colleague and co-worker of Gaynor; the man who thought as Gaynor thought and acted as Gaynor acted!

Our neighbor "The Evening Post" has regretted the lack of humor in the present unpleasantness. If anything funnier than the above was ever written in a political campaign we should be glad to see it.

## The "Ritual Murder" Infamy.

The Kieff trial is chiefly significant as a reminder of the narrow margin which separates some "civilized" countries from barbarism. This persecution of the Jews on a charge which is both monstrously and absurdly false is at par with the persecution of Christians by the Romans in the days of Justin Martyr or the practically identical charge that they used human sacrifices in the Eucharist and with the mad riotings of Chinese against "foreign devils" in recent years for a similar cause. There is no more cause or excuse for this accusation against the Jews than there was for those against Christians.

The hideous libel was first uttered against Jews at Norwich, in the dark days of King Stephen's reign. It has since been repeated many times, chiefly in Eastern Europe. But there is probably no more groundless calumny in the world, none that has been supported with less shadow of plausibility and none that has been more invariably and completely pilloried as false, even by the religious antagonists of those against whom it has been directed. For Frank, the author of perhaps the most convincing vindication of the Jews, was a Roman Catholic priest, while McCall, Strack, Delitzsch and other non-Jews have written powerfully to the same effect. In support of the accusation there has never been one respectable writer.

It is unhelpfully not surprising that the ignorant and superstitious populace of the Russian provinces should now and then revive the monstrous thing, just as voodooism prevails in the recesses of Hayti and juju is still potent in the Guinea hinterland. The most painful feature of the case is that the Russian government gives it countenance by prosecuting suits against Jews for this cause, instead of proceeding against their accusers. It is notorious that these charges are usually trumped up by miscreants whose design is thus to incite "pogroms," in which they will have an opportunity to plunder Jewish shops and to commit still more heinous outrages, and who to that end play upon the passions of the most ignorant and degraded elements of the population. That important officers of the Russian government should periodically lend themselves and the name of the government to such infamies makes us feel that the world has not yet wholly emerged from the age of Nero.

The bunny hug which the Tammany people accuse Mitchell of dancing isn't a patch on the McCall economy tango.

The man who hit Magistrate Corrigan with a club believes in even more direct action than the recall of the judiciary.

The Hon "Jim" Nugent said the other evening that the Democratic organization in Newark, of

which he and "Jim" Smith are the illustrious "Chiefs," "is one of the greatest outside the great Tammany Hall organization in New York." In these days, when things are not going precisely his way, it is a pleasure to register this really "kind word" for Mr. Murphy.

Professor Münsterberg's truth registering machine would be put to a supreme test if it could be got into action here before the campaign closes.

A stream cannot rise any higher than its source. McCall was nominated by Murphy.

## THE TALK OF THE DAY.

Two large wagons, bearing wide canvas side covers upon which was lettered "McCall will be elected despite the efforts of yellow journals. Vote for McCall," passed up Broadway the other day. In one of the wagons was a band, playing popular airs. When they reached 23d street, the band still playing, an ardent McCallite rushed up to one of the wagons and frantically shouted at the bandmaster: "Hey, quit playin' that song. Yer gone crazy!" "What's eatin' you?" demanded the musician. "Why, you boob, you're playin' 'Goodbye, Boys!'"

Mrs. Newlywed—Oh, Jack, you haven't eaten half of my biscuits. Really, we have to throw away so many scraps, we ought to keep chickens.  
Newlywed—Chickens! You mean ostriches.—Boston Transcript.

Charles L. Bernheimer, chairman of the committee on arbitration of the New York Chamber of Commerce, who is treasurer of the fusion campaign committee, found himself in a dilemma the other day, according to his own story. In the morning mail was a large envelope upon which the postage had not been paid. The postman got two cents to take back to Uncle Sam and Mr. Bernheimer ripped the envelope open hastily, his expectations running high, as the campaign funds were running low. Securely wrapped in a piece of paper inside was a five-cent piece. Close examination showed the coin to be lead.

"Now, if I tried to use it," said Mr. Bernheimer, "I would make myself liable to arrest. If I kept it I might be accused of keeping a campaign contribution without making any report of it. As the name of the sender was not given I can't send it back. When I get time I am going to take a ferry ride and throw it into the bay."

"I don't think Bagley is much of a statesman."  
"Why not?"  
"He's been over a year at Washington, and nobody's accused him of overworking his franking privilege."—Denver Republican.

A lawyer who had much trouble in managing the affairs of his office because his wife arrogated the managing clerkship to herself has solved the problem. Because of the activity of his wife in looking after the routine of his office, the attorney had to make frequent changes of stenographers. His spouse has an aversion to going above the fifth floor in a rapid elevator, so the counselor has moved his office to the thirty-second story of a new office building. The wife has not been in his office since, and the attorney expects his stenographer to keep her job for a while.

"You knew your lesson to-day," said the head of the team accusingly.  
"Yes, captain."  
"Well, let it pass this time, but it looks as if you were neglecting your football."—Washington Herald.

The Chinese, according to one of the delegates at the Episcopal General Convention, are the most exacting of worshippers. When they pray to their idols they ask for definite material blessings and they expect results. The life of an idol in China is precarious. Gifts will be heaped before it only as long as it seems to be bringing about the wishes of its followers. If the shrine falls upon evil times and disappoints its worshippers their homage soon fades. Not only do the gifts cease, but the resentful people of the countryside will come in a body and smash the inefficient symbol.

"You will admit a wise man sometimes changes his mind?"  
"Yes," replied Senator Sorghum. "He also changes his wardrobe. But in doing so he avoids popular attention as much as possible."—Washington Star.

## WHAT D'YE MEAN—RETURNED IT!



MURPHY—I returned Mr. Brady's \$25,000.

## THE PEOPLE'S COLUMN

An Open Forum for Public Debate.

## THE SEAMEN'S BILL

## A Reader Urges That Treaties Should Give Way to It.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: I was sorrowfully astonished to read your editorial on Saturday about the seamen's bill.

I gathered from The Tribune a few days earlier that the bill in question had been drafted with the approval of that single-minded expert, Mr. Furuseth, and that it made conditions a little more tolerable and life a little less recklessly endangered in the calling of seamen. These provisions the editorial of Saturday seems to "damn with faint praise," while it urges the President to hesitate long before signing the bill for fear it invalidates treaty rights. If any treaties bind the United States to continue to endanger the lives of our seamen is it not time to amend those treaties?

When in England last summer I read in English papers sad commentaries on their government's refusal to care for the lives of British seamen in (I think) the point covered by our new bill. Can the United States afford to refuse to "raise a standard to which the wise and the honest can repair?"

California and Panama are examples of what liberties we take with treaties when something more valuable (dare we say?) than manhood is at stake.  
S. N. CLEGHORN.  
Manchester, Vt., Oct. 27, 1913.

## WHAT MR. SULZER SAID

## He Did Not Come Out for Goldstein, Say the Hartman Supporters.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: We note in to-day's issue of The Tribune that you state that Mr. Sulzer came out last night for David Goldstein, the Progressive candidate. Your information is not correct.

What Mr. Sulzer stated, on the authority of Mr. Samuel Bell Thomas, one of his closest and most intimate friends, who accompanies him on all his trips, was that if the people did not know how to split their ticket they should vote the straight Progressive ticket. That he was not taking any sides, but was for the strongest man to beat Aaron J. Levy. As among those we can enumerate are Colonel Alexander S. Bacon, the Rev. Dr. Charles H. Parkhurst, the Rev. Dr. Madison C. Peters, Samuel Bell Thomas and Gilbert E. Roe, attorney for Garrison. GUSTAV HARTMAN MUNICIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE, by Hugo Levy, Secretary.  
No. 37 Liberty street, Oct. 28, 1913.

## CLEARING THE SIDEWALKS.

## Architects Strongly Support Mr. McAneny's Work.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: The helpful attitude of The Tribune in the past toward city improvement schemes is well known. It shows a broad-minded spirit on your part, therefore, to publish a letter like that from Albert E. Davis in to-day's issue, which protests against Borough President McAneny's policy of street widening and the removal of street encroachments.

I doubt very much that many people will be influenced by your correspondent's views. It may be of interest to note that the men represented in the New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects have long since gone on record as being heartily in favor of the removal

of street encroachments. In fact, I believe The Tribune has already published a resolution, passed more than a year ago, in which the chapter congratulated the borough presidents on their policy and said (if I remember rightly) that "nothing has been done within the last decade that has added more to the general appearance of the city than has the removal of railings, stoop and other encroachments from certain streets."

Quite aside from this professional opinion, it can hardly be difficult for the average citizen to judge for himself of the effect produced by the borough president's policy upon our streets. I know of men who were inclined in the first place to oppose the plan on account of what seemed to be a needless expense put upon them, and yet they are now perfectly willing to acknowledge that the required changes have so improved their property as to be worth everything they cost.

ROBERT D. KOHN,  
President New York Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.  
New York, Oct. 27, 1913.

## IS SUFFRAGE COMING?

## The "Antis" Deny That They Concede Its Approach.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: During his speech in Madison Square Garden on Tuesday evening, Mrs. Fankhurst said that "even the 'antis' admitted that woman suffrage was sure to come." The suffrage leader's acquaintance with anti-suffragists must be very limited. We have certainly never made such a statement. We are already aware of a tremendous reaction among the women of this country and England against the placing of active and potential motherhood on the political firing line.

Under the educational campaign conducted by anti-suffragists in recent years the suffragists have had to abandon one theory after another upon which their plea for suffrage was formerly based. The early suffragist, for instance, claimed the ballot as woman's right, but since it has been shown that the ballot is not an inherent right for either man or woman this point is no longer made in suffrage speeches. The theory that women who pay taxes should vote has also been given up as an argument by suffrage advocates, for it has been demonstrated that in this country the payment of taxes and voting do not go hand in hand. Even a suffrage leader said last winter that no intelligent suffragist now used the "no taxation without representation" argument, knowing the fallacy upon which it is based. We have been told that the woman in industry needs the ballot for her protection, but it is a fact that the laws protecting women engaged in gainful occupations are better in many instances in the states where women do not vote than they are in the states where woman suffrage has prevailed for many years. Washington and California enacted the much talked of eight-hour law for women in certain industries before women voted in either of those states. But in California this law does not extend to the canning industries, which employ more women than any other one industry in that state, nor have women been able to extend this law to cover canneries since their enfranchisement in California. Women do not vote in any of the states which prohibit all night work for women, nor, on the other hand, is night work prohibited in any state where they do vote.

The assertion has been repeatedly made that woman's vote would purify politics, but Judge Lindsey himself, in "The Beast and the Jungle," drew a horrible picture of political conditions in Denver, and in a recent speech in Boston he spoke of the

"rottenness" (his own language) of Denver politics until the establishment of a third party, last autumn. Furthermore, a prominent suffragist of Colorado recently maintained that "whether women will purify politics, uplift man or stand for a high moral tone is entirely beside the question." So this claim also has been abandoned as an argument for woman suffrage, and there is little left for the suffragists to fall back on now except the assertion voiced by one in authority in the suffrage ranks, who said last winter: "We do not care whether suffrage is a right, a privilege or a responsibility; we want it and propose to have it."

Having pointed out the fallaciousness of these and other claims upon which the plea for woman suffrage rests, it now remains for us to continue our campaign of education and show that woman suffrage is part of the programme of the feminist movement, with its dangerous tendencies, which can only lead to social revolution, and is also indissolubly linked with the doctrines and teachings of socialism. We believe these are two of the gravest dangers involved in the woman suffrage movement at the present time, and we would be false to the faith that is in us if we should relinquish or lessen our endeavors to impress these facts upon the public at all times and seasons.

ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN,  
President of the New York State Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage.  
New York, Oct. 23, 1913.

## FROM AN ANTI-VIVISECTIONIST

## The Movement Is Declared Not To Be a Fight Against Doctors.

To the Editor of The Tribune.  
Sir: One after another the popular misconceptions of the anti-vivisection movement are being corrected; but there still remains an important one, fostered by vivisectionists and their agents, namely, that the movement is a fight against the doctors. This statement needs qualifying, inasmuch as many of its most valuable, or rather invaluable, members are also illustrious and valuable members of the medical profession.

Vivisection is not a legitimate branch of the healing art; it is an evil which, under the honored name of "science," has crept in and gained a foothold. Anti-vivisectionists are fighting this evil, and of necessity those doctors who advocate it, since no evil can materialize without the man behind it.

On the question of vivisection the medical profession is "a house divided against itself." This fact is emphasized by the existence of an "International Medical Anti-Vivisection Association."

It is a French physician who says: "As to vivisection, let them be altogether separated from the medical profession. Their calling is not identical with ours. Their association with us is the cause that some of our colleagues have lost the moral health, the habits of gentleness, of kindness and of compassion which are so essential in the practice of our profession."

It is a member of the Royal College of Surgeons of England who says: "I would have each one of you study the great vivisection question for himself. It is not merely the question of a few guinea pigs and rabbits, but it is the question of a practice which is horribly debasing the race." And it was an American—one of our greatest surgeons—who said: "A torture of helpless animals is now being carried on in all civilized nations in the name of science. There will come a time when the world will look back to modern vivisection in the name of science as it now does to burning at the stake in the name of religion." Similar opinions might be cited indefinitely.

ANTI-VIVISECTIONIST.  
Baltimore, Oct. 25, 1913.